	K6CALERSps	
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
2	X	
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
4	V.	(S2) 12-cr-489 (RA) 14-cr-075 (RA)
5	PAUL CALDER LEROUX, a/k/a "Bernard John Bowlins,"	II OI 073 (Idi)
6	a/k/a "John Smith," a/k/a "Johan Smit,"	
7	Defendant.	Sentence
8	x	
9		New York, N.Y. (via telephone)
11		June 12, 2020 11:30 a.m.
12		
13	Before:	
14	HON. RONNIE ABRAN	1S
15		District Judge
16	APPEARANCES	
17	GEOFFREY S. BERMAN	
18	United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York	
19	BY: MICHAEL D. LOCKARD, ESQ. Assistant United States Attorney	
20	LAW OFFICE OF JAMES M. BRANDEN	
21	Attorneys for Defendant BY: JEFFREY CHABROWE, ESQ.	
22	JAMES M. BRANDEN, ESQ.	
23		
24		
25		

(Via telephone)

THE COURT: Good morning, everyone.

We're here for United States v. Paul Calder Leroux.

There are two docket numbers, docket no. 12 Crim. 489, and 14

Crim. 75.

There is a little bit of feedback on one person's line. When you're not talking, if you can mute your line, that would be helpful.

All right. So, first of all, this is a reminder that this is a public proceeding. You are able to access the proceeding through the public call number. All participants are reminded that any recording or rebroadcasting of any portion of this proceeding is strictly prohibited.

I'm still getting a lot of feedback. Can you all hear and see me?

A VOICE: Yes, Judge.

MR. LOCKARD: For the government, yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. CHABROWE: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So we're of course in the middle of the COVID-19 pandemic. I am conducting this proceeding remotely pursuant to the authority provided by Section 15002 of the CARES Act and the standing orders issued by our chief judge pursuant to the act. I am proceeding by video conference. Counsel are appearing remotely also via

video conference, as is the defendant, Mr. Leroux, who is accessing this video conference from the GEO facility.

Mr. Leroux, I'm going to confirm again, sir, that you can see me and hear me. Can you see me and hear me?

THE DEFENDANT: I can see you and I can hear you, your Honor. I can see you.

THE COURT: If at any point during this proceeding you are unable to see or hear me or other participants, let me know right away and we can address the problem. OK?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. All right, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. Also, you should know that if you would like to speak privately with your attorney, you are free to do so. We will move you into a remote breakout room where no one else can see you or hear you. So you have that right. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: So I understand from defense counsel,
Mr. Leroux, that you wish to waive your physical presence and
proceed by video conference today. Is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And did your attorney explain to you that you have a right to be present in court when you are sentenced and that by --

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: -- consenting to proceed by video conference you are waiving that right? Do you understand that?

Yes? Is that right, Mr. Leroux?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. Thank you.

Can counsel please describe the process by which you discussed with Mr. Leroux his right to be present and his willing and voluntary waiver of that right.

MR. CHABROWE: Your Honor, I discussed with Mr. Leroux the option of doing the sentencing remotely or doing it live in a courtroom and, you know, when that potentially could be or so forth and so on, and how this would be potentially different.

And Mr. Leroux, after a lengthy discussion, said that he wanted to go forward with this, doing it by video as we're doing it today.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

It looks like we lost the government momentarily, so I'm going to wait until Mr. Lockard is back on.

THE COURT REPORTER: Your Honor, if it's all right for me to interrupt during this pause, the speaker who just spoke for the defense, was that Mr. Branden or Mr. Chabrowe? Please remember I do not have a video feed, only voice.

MR. CHABROWE: I'm sorry. That was me, Mr. Chabrowe. And prior to speaking next time in going forward, I will always identify myself as such. I apologize.

THE COURT: Thank you.

THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. We have lost the government on the video feed. So we're just going to pause momentarily.

(Pause)

MR. LOCKARD: Your Honor, can you hear me?

THE COURT: Yes. We can hear you now.

MR. LOCKARD: OK.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

I find that Mr. Leroux has knowingly and voluntarily waived the right to be physically present for this sentencing.

I also find that today's proceeding cannot be further delayed without serious harm to the interest of justice.

This matter is on for sentencing in United States v.

Paul Calder Leroux. Mr. Leroux pled guilty before Judge

Patterson in December 2014 to conspiracy to import and

distribute methamphetamine, unlicensed exportation of goods and

technology from the United States to a third country,

conspiracy to commit computer hacking, and accessory after the

fact.

In March 2016, he pled guilty before Judge Patterson to conspiracy to introduce into interstate commerce misbranded drugs, conspiracy to commit mail and wire fraud, and conspiracy to commit money laundering.

So those were two different indictment numbers. The

first three counts were from indictment no. 12 Crim. 489, or the first four counts. And the last three counts were part of indictment no. 14 Crim. 75. Those actions were reassigned to Judge Preska after the death of Judge Patterson and then reassigned to me on May 23rd, 2019, in light of Mr. Leroux's testimony before me pursuant to a cooperation agreement in the trial of Joseph Hunter, Adam Samia, and Carl David Stillwell in case no. 13 Crim. 521, which took place in April of 2018.

Mr. Leroux was arrested on September 26, 2012 in Monrovia, Liberia. On September 27, 2012, he made his initial appearance before the Southern District of New York and was remanded.

In connection with today's proceeding I've reviewed the following submissions: the revised presentence investigation report dated May 20, 2020, which includes a recommendation and addendum; Mr. Leroux's sentencing memorandum dated June 5, 2020, with accompanying exhibits; as well as a subsequent letter that I received yesterday, June 11th; the government's sentencing memorandum dated May 28, 2020, as well as a subsequent letter that I received on June 12th.

I've also received various letters from the parties with respect to redactions of the public filings.

Have the parties received each of these submissions?

MR. LOCKARD: Yes, your Honor.

MR. BRANDEN: Yes, Judge. Jim Branden. Yes.

1	MR. CHABROWE: Jeff Chabrowe also.	
2	THE COURT: And the government?	
3	MR. LOCKARD: For the government, yes, your Honor.	
4	We've received those submissions.	
5	THE COURT: All right. And am I missing anything? Is	
6	there anything else that was submitted to the Court that I have	
7	not mentioned?	
8	MR. BRANDEN: Jim Branden. No, Judge.	
9	MR. CHABROWE: Your Honor, there was a letter Jeff	
10	Chabrowe, excuse me there was a letter that we submitted	
11	last night from Mr. Leroux on ECF to the Court?	
12	THE COURT: That I did not receive. So let me get	
13	that now.	
14	MR. CHABROWE: OK.	
15	THE COURT: Did you file that on the docket?	
16	MR. CHABROWE: Yes, your Honor. And I did get a	
17	bounce for it. Let me see.	
18	MR. LOCKARD: Your Honor, this is the government.	
19	It's docket no. 67 in the 12 Crim. 489 docket.	
20	THE COURT: OK.	
21	All right. I'm getting out the letter. Since I'm on	
22	the court call I couldn't do it at the same time, but I just	
23	accessed it and I'm reading it now.	
24	All right. I have read the letter. Thank you.	
25	So let's begin by discussing the presentence report	

which was prepared by the Probation Department].

Mr. Branden or Mr. Chabrowe, have you reviewed the presentence report and discussed it with your client?

MR. BRANDEN: Jim Branden. Yes, I have, Judge.

THE COURT: And do you have any objections to the presentence report?

MR. BRANDEN: No, we do not.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Leroux, have you reviewed the presentence report and have you had enough of an opportunity to discuss it with your attorneys?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have, your Honor. I have reviewed the report extensively and I have discussed it with my attorneys.

THE COURT: Does the government have any objection to the presentence report?

MR. LOCKARD: This is the government. No, your Honor, we have no objections.

THE COURT: The presentence report will be made a part of the record in this matter and placed under seal. I adopt the factual findings in the report. If an appeal is taken, counsel on appeal may have access to the sealed report without further application to the Court.

Mr. Leroux, when you pled guilty both in December 2014 and in March 2016, you discussed the federal sentencing guidelines with Judge Patterson. The guidelines are a set of

K6CALERSps

rules published by the United States Sentencing Commission in order to guide judges when they impose sentence. Although at one time they were mandatory, meaning the judges were required to follow them, they are no longer binding on judges, but judges must consider them in determining an appropriate sentence and must thus ensure that they have properly computed the guidelines calculation.

I understand that the parties agree with the guidelines calculated in the presentence report pursuant to which Mr. Leroux is facing a guidelines range of life in prison. Is that correct?

MR. BRANDEN: Yes, Judge. Jim Branden. Yes.

MR. LOCKARD: For the government, no objections to the PSR calculations. But, your Honor, just one minor procedural clarification? Mr. Leroux pleaded guilty to the charges in both informations in the same proceeding held in February of 2014 before Judge Patterson.

THE COURT: Oh. Thank you very much.

All right. So based on the parties' agreement and my independent evaluation of the sentencing guidelines, I accept the guidelines calculation in the presentence report. I find that Mr. Leroux's offense level is 43, his criminal history category is I, and his recommended guidelines sentence is life. As I said a moment ago, that range is only advisory. Courts may impose a sentence outside of that range based on one of two

legal concepts: a departure or a variance. A departure allows for a sentence outside of the advisory range based on some provision in the guidelines. A variance, by contrast, is based on factors set forth in a provision of the federal law. It's 18 United States Code § 3553(a).

I'd like to hear now from the parties. Would the government like to be heard with respect to the sentencing?

MR. LOCKARD: Yes, your Honor. And as noted in our sentencing submissions, at this time the government formally moves that the defendant be sentenced pursuant to Title 18
United States Code § 3553(b) and Section 5K1.1 of the United States Sentencing Guidelines.

THE COURT: That motion is granted. Is there anything else you'd like to say today?

MR. LOCKARD: Your Honor has, as the Court noted, voluminous written materials that have been submitted in connection with the sentencing, and has also had an opportunity to directly observe defendant during his extensive testimony, during the Hunter trial, and I think, in light of that volume, perhaps the most effective way for the government to proceed would be to perhaps answer any questions or address any issues that the Court would like us to address.

THE COURT: One question I'd like you to address: In Mr. Leroux's letter, he says that with respect to a charge in the Philippines, he has agreed that he will not contest

extradition from the U.S., will not contest a weapons trafficking charge, does not contest superseding charges for murder on his arrival in the Philippines, and will pay restitution in the Philippines to victims' families.

He says that he will face a mandatory minimum of eight years in prison in the Philippines and a maximum of 12 years in prison.

Is that accurate? One of the things that I have to do here is, I have to balance a whole host of factors, and I'm going to talk about them a little bit later. But I have to think about the danger that Mr. Leroux can present in the future to society at large. And if he is indeed going to be incarcerated in the Philippines, that may weigh into my decision.

MR. LOCKARD: The short answer, your Honor, is, I do not know. I know over the course of this matter, the government has had discussions over time with Mr. Leroux's prior U.S. criminal defense counsel about efforts to resolve potential charges in the Philippines by way of a plea, including potentially a plea in absentia. But I have been advised that that's never been finalized and don't have any independent knowledge about the status of that process.

THE COURT: What's your understanding as to where he will be extradited upon his release from incarceration in the United States?

MR. LOCKARD: So I say this not speaking on behalf of ICE, but it's my understanding that Mr. Leroux, if he were to be deported or removed, would be removed either to South Africa or Australia, where he is a passport holder. I believe there is an extradition treaty between the United States and the Philippines, but I don't believe there is an extradition treaty between South Africa and the Philippines, and I believe there is an extradition treaty between Australia and the Philippines — all of which is to say, if the Philippines were to submit an extradition request to the United States and he did not contest it or consented to extradition, I imagine he would be extradited to the Philippines.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

And can you confirm the open case against him there?

MR. LOCKARD: I am aware from discussions between U.S.

law enforcement and Philippines law enforcement that Mr. Leroux

has been the subject of ongoing Philippines law enforcement

interests. I don't have any information about charges filed

against him and haven't received this information from the

Philippines Department of Justice or any prosecutor's office.

MR. CHABROWE: Judge, if I may, it's our understanding that the Philippines renewed their extradition request for Mr. Leroux as recently as January just now, based upon their following the sentencing coming soon in this case, and that that request for extradition was just renewed in January of

1 2020.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Lockard, would any victims like to be heard today?

MR. LOCKARD: Your Honor, not that I'm aware of.

Notifications were made through law enforcement channels to law enforcement in the United Kingdom and in the Philippines, and we were staying in contact with any victims if they wished to be heard, and I have not been advised that any victims have so indicated.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Would defense counsel like to be heard?

MR. CHABROWE: Yes, your Honor. I think -- I would like to be heard briefly. I was going to go first. I'm sorry. Jeff Chabrowe for Mr. Leroux. I was going to speak first. I believed that Mr. Branden would be speaking after me. I am going to be discussing the leaks briefly. I know that this is something that we've submitted voluminous material to the Court and we've discussed it quite a bit.

A couple of points that were not made in our submissions, your Honor. There are a number of podcasts actually that exist online, most recently one from 2019, with Elaine Shannon, who is the author of the book *Hunting Leroux*, Tommy Cindric, one of the former DEA agents, and Lou Milione, who was the agent and the head of the 960 unit, discussing the book, also discussing a movie that will be forthcoming about

the book. In this interview, your Honor, Lou Milione says that, talking to Elaine Shannon, they gave her information about the investigation in Mr. Leroux that they wouldn't have given to anyone else because they trusted her. He says specifically, quote/unquote, we have the clearance to be able to speak to her and it wouldn't have been with anybody else, although it's our understanding that Ms. Shannon did certainly share a lot of this information as well.

Our understanding, your Honor, is that there actually is a movie being made about -- that's already in preproduction -- about *Hunting Leroux*, being made, produced by Michael Mann. And Lou Milione from the DEA, who used to be an actor prior to being an DEA agent, is actually going to be playing himself in the movie.

Another issue, your Honor, is that a lot of the discovery from this case was actually uploaded to YouTube, including details about Mr. Leroux's family, descriptions of the family. There's a clip of him sitting at a computer -- it says "DEA surveillance" on it -- to sort of use as somewhat of, I guess, a teaser for the book.

A number of description from the book, your Honor — and these are all thing that could not have been obtained by Ms. Shannon unless she had been told this information, that she'd gotten any sort of confidential information. There's a description of, specifically in the book, page 99, Mr. Leroux's

children, different women that he's been with, who are the mothers of each children. Page 289, there's a confidential source recording in a hotel shortly before Mr. Leroux is arrested, a description of a child of his as an infant who they described as a beady-eyed baby. There is a description from when Mr. Leroux's hotel room was bugged, a recording of he and his wife having sex and things that are said during that time. In the book there is a description of DEA Agent Tommy Cindric's personal discussion with Mr. Leroux. This is just the two of them talking about how many children he had and who were the mothers of those children. And then another conversation that takes place about Mr. Leroux's abuse that he suffered from his father, how that affected him.

These are all things that are very, very personal about his family or just about him, about his children, about his wives, that were all released by the DEA to Elaine Shannon for writing the book. There is a recorded conversation between a confidential informant and an undercover about the sale of methamphetamine.

And then I think most disturbing, your Honor, there is a very, very detailed descriptive discussion in the book, on page 365 of what I'm looking at, of one of the first proffers with Mr. Leroux in Brooklyn, describes exactly who is at the proffer, and Mr. Lockard. And actually I think it's the first proffer. There are supervisors present. Everybody is present.

K6CALERSps

It describes what a proffer is. And towards -- I believe this is where there is the first discussion of the signing of a cooperation agreement.

And I'm reading from the notes actually right now of Ms. Shannon's book. It states, "Leroux's admissions for his plea bargain are contained in the proposed cooperation agreement for Paul Leroux, drafted by the attorneys in the office of the U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of New York," and then it names a number of U.S. Attorneys who signed off on this.

And then this is what is most troubling:

quote/unquote -- this was not made part of the public court

record but was obtained by the author. This is on page 527 of

the paperback. It's very clear, your Honor, that this is then

the proposed plea agreement. And we had submitted something to

the Court yesterday in camera to look at this. It's very clear

that the proposed plea agreement, which contains 3500 material,

as well as, I think, notes from proffers, was given to

Ms. Shannon. We would assume it was done so by the DEA. This

was signed on February 4th of 2013. Once again, she clearly

states it was not made part of the public record but was

obtained by the author.

There is a description in the book, page 379, of, I believe it's Tommy Cindric, questioning Mr. Leroux. "You're not being totally honest. You have to tell us about the

murders, tell us about the murders." Not only is this not even in a proffer; it's actually in a hallway outside, nothing that — this goes way beyond anything that would have been in a proffer or in 3500 material.

There are descriptions in the book about Mr. Leroux setting up an FTP server for Iranian officials to access weapons plans that he uploaded without directly implicating themselves of a designed explosive, which is called PETN, which Ms. Shannon repeatedly calls "the coffee sweetener bomb."

These are things, your Honor, that were never in trial testimony, not something Ms. Shannon could have known unless it had been leaked to her.

Yesterday, in a submission in the afternoon, the government finally admitted, after years really, that the DEA agents here leaked info from the case, referring to the leaks as regrettable and unfortunate. However, what struck me, your Honor, one of the most revealing things of this submission is a footnote. On page 4 -- this is from yesterday afternoon -- where the government states, "The government did not discuss the case with the book's author and did not review the information provided by the DEA."

So this is sort of buried in the government's submission yesterday, where they're saying that they did not know, they don't know what the DEA gave to the author. It was not reviewed by them. And I think it's very clear that they

K6CALERSps

had no idea what was provided or how much.

The government's submission yesterday when they're finally acknowledging the leaks is at times contradictory in and of itself. And they're repeatedly saying that there were leaks but all of the information, a lot of the information came based upon public interest in the case.

The government also seems to be justifying the leaks and saying that there was a great, deep degree of public interest. They specifically say that Agents Cindric and Milione spoke to Ms. Shannon with the express approval of the DEA, and this was done based upon public interest and the significance of the case — seemingly saying that if the DEA makes a determination that a case is of significant public interest and significance, they can then make their own determination, regardless, I guess, of the U.S. Attorney's Office involved at that point, to speak to the press or anyone else based upon that.

I think, your Honor, this doesn't make sense. I think that any case with that amount of public interest, where the government or certainly the DEA should be acting with more discretion, not less, perhaps there should be some situations, especially when you're talking about things like 3500 material and proffer notes, it's up to the government to make any sort of disclosures to the press. Leaving that in the hands of DEA is not at all appropriate, especially when we're talking about

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

cooperation and confidential information. Not only is justifying this as public interest incorrect and putting Mr. Leroux at risk, but I think that it also creates a very dangerous precedent in that it's going to chill or deter people from cooperating in the future, particularly in high-interest cases, where you're saying that, if there's a lot of interest in the case, it's OK for the DEA to be leaking things to the press. Not only could this cause, I think, a chill on cooperation in the future, but it also creates a situation where it's encouraging DEA agents to not only leak to the press in cases they determine to be those of public interest, but even more dangerously, perhaps even looking for cases that are deemed to be of great public interest so they can then do what Mr. Cindric and Mr. Milione did and sell their story to authors or to movie producers. And that's very clearly what happened here.

The government states in their letter yesterday that the DEA expressly approved them speaking to Ms. Shannon, but I would imagine that the DEA did not expressly approve Agents Cindric and Milione to then quit and sell their story. And I'm sure that they received money for this. As I stated, there is now being a movie made with Mr. Milione actually playing himself in the movie.

The government also repeatedly states in their submission yesterday that the amount of information that is out

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

by the government.

There was a number of evidence, different examples I gave, where it's very clear that there are leaks made to

Ms. Shannon. Our sentencing memorandum repeatedly talks about that this is not what was in trial testimony, as the government stated, although it seems to be now retreating from that position. Not once has the government been able to point out a

opposed to public interest causing the information to be leaked

single example of any of the leaks that we've said where they said no, this is the source of that. Instead, they just sort of vaguely refer to, oh, well, there's a lot of public interest, there's a lot of press attention. Every single example that we gave is something that Ms. Shannon could not have known about unless she got it — they've never been able to point out another source of this information.

I believe --

THE COURT: Let me just ask you a question,

Mr. Chabrowe. Even if everything you say is true, we're here

for a sentencing of a very violent criminal. Other than the

physical harm that these alleged leaks may have caused

Mr. Leroux or his -- or potential harm it may have caused

Mr. Leroux or his family, how should I factor this in at

sentencing today, in your view?

MR. CHABROWE: Well, obviously, your Honor, you know, 5K1 states that the risk that Mr. Leroux faces or that his family faces are very much factors that your Honor should consider when fashioning a downward departure.

THE COURT: And I was going to factor those in anyway of course.

MR. CHABROWE: OK. And I apologize for being -- I was just getting to that point. But I think that the risk that he and his family face are quite substantial. Melanie, who is the mother of one of Mr. Leroux's children, was abducted and held

K6CALERSps

for ransom in the Philippines. There were other home invasions in the Philippines. There were police reports for all of these things were submitted to the Court in our sentencing memorandum.

I think that there is also a lot of information that Mr. Leroux gave that's in the book that was not disclosed otherwise, that was not at trial, where Mr. Leroux is talking about corruption in the Philippines particularly. And he is, as your Honor mentioned earlier in the sentencing, Mr. Leroux is now going to be going to the Philippines. This is now when he's going to be most at risk, going where I think that they certainly have an ax to grind against them. He's going to be going there and held. He's going to be charged with murder and weapons trafficking. And he's going to be very much at risk not just being in the Philippines, your Honor, but being in a jail system where it's much easier for them to get at him and in a jail system that, you know, this is not like being here, at GEO, certainly not anywhere here, where people are much more at risk from corrupt prison officials or organized crime.

I think that one example, your Honor, and when we're talking about what could happen to Mr. Leroux once he's there, beyond the risk to him and his family, that his co-defendant on the case, one of his co-defendants on the drug case that he had in the Philippines, Brian Hill, was sentenced to life already in the Philippines. There is an arresting officer in that

case, Leonardo Swann, who was also the arresting officer in another case of a South Korean businessman named Jee Ick-joo. And this is something that happened recently in the Philippines where this man was arrested, there were repeated, repeated efforts to extort him for money, that he was tortured while in custody. And while I think his wife was actually present, there were efforts made where there was some money turned over, and while Philippine officials were trying to extort him for more money and torturing him, they accidentally killed him. This is a case that has gotten some press attention, as stated. The arresting officer on the case for Mr. Hill, who is Mr. Leroux's co-defendant, is one of the same officers who was involved in this. And this is unfortunately what Mr. Leroux is going to be dealing with going forward.

So I think that, I think your Honor could certainly integrate this by considering alternatively deterrence of future conduct by law enforcement, encourage responsibility and accountability going forward.

But I think that the risks that Mr. Leroux and his family are facing are not only significant, but are perhaps, just now the real risks to Mr. Leroux are just now starting from the fact that he is certainly going to be extradited to the Philippines. And I think that — I know that there are many, I'm sure that there are many people in the Philippines base upon what we have submitted — I know there is some other

stuff Mr. Branden has talked about -- who, Mr. Leroux has a lot of enemies there. And I think that the release of the information by Ms. Shannon has certainly exacerbated that situation.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Branden, is there anything you would like to add?

MR. BRANDEN: Yes, Judge. Thank you.

Like the government noted, we have written a great deal about Mr. Leroux in these sentencing submission. For a cooperator I don't normally write at such length, but this is an outside case on so many different levels. The number of crimes that are detailed in the presentence report require attention. But on the other hand, so does the extraordinary cooperation that this defendant provided. I think that in the government's letter from yesterday, they admitted that there is really no precedence for this amount of cooperation. Part of that of course is because of the degree of the criminality. But he has probably proffered more than anybody else in the Southern District ever. He gives assistance to the government —

THE COURT: I don't know where that figure came from, by the way.

MR. BRANDEN: I don't know. Somebody told me that and I threw it down in the submissions expecting maybe there would a challenge, and there wasn't. So I'm not asking the Court to

take it as the gospel truth. But I would have expected that the government would say, no, that's not true, if they believed it to be untrue. At the very least, the cooperation and proffering was extensive.

So I'm not going to go through all of the 5K1 factors. But certainly the cooperation has been extraordinary. As a result of his extensive cooperation, he's also spent eight years in detention. Generally serving time in detention is far worse than serving time in BOP custody. And I think that's true here. But in addition he's also been the subject of an assault. He was the subject of extortionate press. He's had serious health issues while he's been in. And I suggest that this eight years was worth more than just eight years.

And as Mr. Chabrowe noted, I think that there will be severe collateral consequences for him when he's returned to the Philippines, not just legally, perhaps extrajudicially, but also the security agencies and the mercenaries out there that are looking to target him anew pose a very, very serious threat to him.

And I just want to note finally that the government's letter from yesterday answers your Honor's question about whether this particular defendant is a threat to anybody at the moment. And while the government couldn't rule that out, under no circumstances, I think that it's a fair assessment of what they're saying to you is, no, he is not a threat to anyone at

this present time.

So without getting, you know, reviewing everything
I've already said in writing, he's served nearly eight years in
prison already, eight years in detention already. Especially
given what he's facing in the Philippines, in which he will
almost surely face another decade of imprisonment, he should be
sentenced to a term of time served.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Lockard, was your position in that letter that he doesn't pose a danger to the community, or just that there are no particular individuals at this point in time that you know he presents a danger to?

MR. LOCKARD: Your Honor, it was the latter. We're not aware that he poses a danger to any particular person or persons upon his release. And I think we walk the Court through sort of our analysis of whether or not he poses a risk of danger to the community, essentially through the risk of recidivism.

THE COURT: And that he does continue to pose such a risk.

MR. LOCKARD: I think you have to say -- well, since I can't say no, he poses no risk, then I have to say yes, he poses some degree of risk. That risk is difficult to quantify. But I think it certainly is -- his past gives a reason to believe that there's a risk, the incident involving Mr. Islam,

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Those kinds of businesses can be operated in a perfectly legal

manner. But it's also true that, you know, cryptocurrency is a hot topic among law enforcement in terms of things like money-

is anything illegal about operating a bitcoin mining business.

laundering risks, sanctions evasion, and counter-

terrorism-finance risk. And, you know, it is, I would say it's not a comfort to know that that's Mr. Leroux's plan.

THE COURT: You also noted in your latest letter that his sentencing advocacy to date reflects little if any remorse, rehabilitation, or acceptance of responsibility beyond that required by guideline provision 3E1.1.

MR. LOCKARD: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

Mr. Leroux, would you like to be heard at all? I read your letter, but I'm happy to hear anything you'd like to say today.

THE DEFENDANT: I would, your Honor. I would.

I would just like to thank the Court for offering me the opportunity to speak, your Honor. And also I'd like to apologize to the Court for my acts and conduct in this case. I really have no words to describe my conduct. I'd like to

K6CALERSps

apologize to the victims' families. All I can say, your Honor, is, I have no excuses. I have been diagnosed with mental health issues. I've been diagnosed at GEO. I saw the psychologist in 2013. I started mental health treatment. I was diagnosed with anxiety, depression, post-traumatic stress disorder, and a personality disorder. And I saw the psychologist and I tried to treat myself. The PSR says I didn't undertake any treatment. That is not true. I did counseling with the psychologist. I can't take medications because I have liver damage. But I did do counseling.

Also, your Honor, I'd like to say that it was the tremendous hyperbole of the media and the hyperboles that I have no feelings and I have no remorse. But that's not true, your Honor. I stay awake at night. I sleep one or two hours. And I told the prosecutor that during prep for the trial, when I testified in front of you. I sleep one, two hours. I think about my terrible crimes all the time. I just don't understand what happened.

I would like to tell you something about my family, too, your Honor. I spoke last week to my eight-year-old son. He told me, "Dad, I've never seen you in my whole life. When are you coming home?" And I understand, it broke my heart, I understand how the victims' families must feel. I can only apologize over and over again. So many of these people will not have any more chance to reunite with their family members.

What I have done, your Honor, is, I've cooperated in the federal case. I submitted to your Honor, to the Court, the original arrest warrant for the weapons-trafficking conduct, and that includes relevant conduct, at least one of the murders that occurred in Philippines. That was dated in 2000 and actually predates the instant case. That was updated by the Filipino government in January of 2020. And the reason for that is, they have worked on and submitted an extradition, as I understand it, although presumably things have slowed down because of the COVID-19 pandemic that's no doubt slowed things down as well as it has slowed things down here in the United States.

So what I've been saying is, I haven't cooperated there. The USA will extradite me. There are outstanding arrest warrants in the Philippines. And I have agreed I will pay restitution, and that's the first thing I plan to do. For family members that I destroyed and for the families that have suffered I'll pay restitution immediately.

My own family, as it happens, relies on me on a daily basis for money. Nobody else has helped them in the Philippines. Most of them are in hiding and afraid for their lives. The leaks have been absolutely devastating, not in respect so much to myself but with respect to their safety. They said they effectively have death sentences on their heads, your Honor. The Philippines is a dangerous country. Criminal

groups and the police are involved in kidnapping and murder in the Philippines on a wholesale basis. I can't say enough about the danger to my family, because I just can't put it into words.

I refer you to the first promotional portion of the campaign in the Philippines in 2013. And I refer you to the first home invasion in 2015. The dangers in the Philippines are immense. My co-defendant, Mr. Brian Hill, in his trial testimony he stated he was extorted by the police in prison and he still received a life sentence. Also there was the example mentioned earlier by Mr. Chabrowe, I believe, about a South Korean businessman arrested and killed by the police. He was arrested by the same arresting officer as arrested — (unintelligible).

In the government sentencing submission, that said that I met the government in February, on or about February 2020, and I said that my family was OK. This is because I had nothing more to add, your Honor. I had already submitted a witness protection request for some of my family members, which was actually denied on that day. And the problem with my family is, your Honor, is, they're not even cooperating with me, never mind the government. They're not cooperating because they believe any information they will provide will be leaked immediately, rightly or wrongly. And that is the situation. I can't get documentation from them. They don't want to send

anything to me for sentencing. I had to beg to get all the documents from them relating to the kidnapping incident, relating to the home invasions, and relating to the fact that they have been followed, extorted, arrests. There's been vandalisms of my, my properties.

I expect that I should suffer, your Honor. I should be punished. But my family have done nothing wrong. They have not done anything, not committed any crimes, and effectively all the leaks in this case have put a very big mark on the back of their, of their heads. It's just a miracle, your Honor, nobody has been killed yet in this case.

I hope and I pray that the Court will take into account the fact that I was arrested on a nonviolent drug offense. Apart from the example in the case in Count One, the drugs involved are all in — (unintelligible). I would have, I would have to say, if I had just stayed quiet, it's likely that my plea would have been 25 to 30 years. It's up to the government and up to the Court what my eventual sentence would have been, but I understand that the government said that there wasn't enough information to charge me with any single act of violence. All the information, almost all the information in the PSR and almost all the information in the — (unintelligible) — against me came from me. If I had just stayed quiet, I likely would have been sentenced like a one—time drug offender. And that is the wrong thing to do. In

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

this situation, I need to bring closure. I don't want to run from the crimes that I've committed. I want to do my time in the U.S. Whatever your sentence is today, your Honor, I want to do that time and I want to do the time and should --(unintelligible) -- because I caused damage to victims' family and they deserve closure. The government has repeatedly said that the government wants justice for Catherine Lee. However, your Honor, it's not possible for Catherine Lee to have a full measure of justice here in the U.S. for the simple reason that most of the co-conspirators are in the Philippines and are not subject to U.S. jurisdiction in respect to them. So the only way for me to have a full measure of justice is for me to be returned to the Philippines for the arrest warrants that exist as well as the superseding indictment for multiple murders which occurred in the Philippines, and for me to cooperate and bring into the system all the co-conspirators in the Philippines that I conspired with in that time. I'm the most culpable person and I'm the person in the best position to bring those people in and make sure they face justice. And I would have no objection to the government removing me to the Philippines, because none of them can very easily verify that the charges in the Philippines exist and are valid.

Now, in respect to the bitcoin mining, bitcoin mining relates to the fact, your Honor, that I have an electronics background. I need to follow the line of work that aligns with

my skill set. I have a programming background. I have an electronics background. I can't sit here and tell the Court that I'm going to do something which does not align with my background. So the bitcoin mining, yes, if I understand, there are criminals involved in that business, as there are criminals involved in everything. But I intend to follow the laws. I intend to follow the regulations. I intend to approach that business correctly.

And I really have no explanation what happened to this case, no excuse for my actions. And my actions are unforgivable. And, again, I would like to apologize to the Court, to the victims' families.

And that's all I have to say, your Honor. Thank you for your time.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Leroux.

Mr. Lockard, is there anything you want to say with respect to what information you had about these acts of violence before Mr. Leroux began to assist the government?

MR. LOCKARD: Sure, your Honor. And I think this will also address in part some of the arguments that Mr. Chabrowe made. One of the important pieces of information about Mr. Leroux that was already publicly available prior to his arrest is the fact that he was discussed in a U.N. report about instability and drug trafficking in Somalia, as a result of his attempts to establish, you know, essentially a paramilitary

K6CALERSps

base in that country for weapons and drug trafficking. And that is a publicly available document that the U.N. published in 2011.

treated as a run-of-the-mill narcotics defendant had the case been resolved solely on the basis of the initial indictment. The murders of several of the individuals in the Philippines was the subject of public reporting. And U.S. law enforcement certainly was aware of indications that Mr. Leroux was involved in or had directed some of those murders. The information wasn't sufficient to charge. And, you know, there is not — there was not an apparent U.S. jurisdictional basis to those murders at the time. But I think it's a bit of a stretch to say that that information could not have been developed for sentencing purposes.

So I think Mr. Leroux faced serious charges. I think that is, you know, why he made the decision to cooperate, because he knew about the seriousness of the charges that he faced. And he did cooperate. And he lived up to his cooperation obligations.

But to directly answer the Court's question, no, Mr. Leroux would not have been treated as an ordinary drug defendant.

THE COURT: Is there any reason that sentence cannot be imposed at this time? Does anyone else want to be heard

further?

MR. CHABROWE: Jeff Chabrowe for Mr. Leroux. No reason, no, your Honor, no.

MR. BRANDEN: Jim Branden. No reason, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

I am required to consider the advisory guidelines range of life in prison as well as various other factors that are set forth in a provision of the federal law. It's 18

United States Code § 3553(a). And I have done so. Those factors include but are not limited to the nature and circumstances of the offense and the personal history and characteristics of the defendant, because every defendant must be considered individually as a person. Judges are also required to consider the need for the sentence imposed to reflect the seriousness of the offense, promote respect for the law, provide just punishment for the offense, afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct, protect the public from future crimes of the defendant, and avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities, among other things.

Let me put that -- and, Mr. Lockard, if you can turn your computer on mute, please. I think there's a little feedback.

MR. LOCKARD: I apologize, your Honor.

THE COURT: Let me put that in nonlegal terms. Most judges agree that the hardest thing we do in our jobs is to

sentence people. It is indescribably difficult for a human being to judge another human being, decide if they should be deprived of their freedom, and if so for how long. Each sentence is difficult -- although, in all candor, some sentences are more difficult than others. This sentencing is especially difficult for an unusual reason. And that is because there is no question in my mind that Paul Calder Leroux deserves to spend the rest of his life in prison. And I don't say that lightly. Indeed, the only people I have sentenced to prison for life in my time on the bench are three members of Mr. Leroux's own mercenary crew: Joseph Hunter, Adam Samia, and Carl David Stillwell, all of whom faced mandatory life sentences after being convicted of the murder for hire at trial, the murder of Catherine Lee, a murder ordered by Mr. Leroux.

Most criminal defendants have prior kindnesses or charitable deeds that they highlight to the Court. They show genuine remorse, efforts at rehabilitation, or they at least try and persuade me that they are no longer a danger to society. Not so here, not really. I mean, today was the first day I have heard Mr. Leroux express any remorse.

While Mr. Leroux has only been charged and pled guilty to nonviolent crimes, those crimes alone provide for a guidelines sentence of life in prison. But they don't tell half the story, as jurisdiction was lacking, and evidence in

some respects, with respect to much of what he has done in his life. Indeed, the scope and severity of Mr. Leroux's criminal conduct is nothing short of breathtaking. He agreed in his plea agreement that all of it can be considered relevant conduct at sentencing.

I have before me a man who has engaged in conduct in keeping with the villain in a James Bond movie. He operated a mercenary team that committed beatings, shootings, and firebombs. He participated in the murder for hire of at least seven people.

And let's just pause there for a minute. There are seven people -- Herbert Chu, David Smith, Chito, Naomi Edillor, Catherine Lee, Joe Frank Zuñiga, and Bruce Jones -- whose loved ones will never see them, hold them, or speak to them again. In the case of Catherine Lee, she was shot in the face and her lifeless body was left on a pile of garbage. Others were shot and their bodies anchored to boats and sunk in the water. The bodies of others still have not yet been found.

Mr. Leroux trafficked in illegal pharmaceuticals: methamphetamine and cocaine. He smuggled gold, chemicals, and weapons on several continents. He ran a weapons research and development program for the Iranian government. He attempted to acquire surface-to-air missiles. He laundered funds from a pharmaceutical company. He planned a coup in the Seychelles. And he bribed government officials in the Philippines, China,

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1819

20

21

22

23

24

25

Laos, Africa, and Brazil. If Paul Calder Leroux had a situation that he could bribe or kill his way out of, he did so.

So why is this sentencing difficult? Why shouldn't he just get a life sentence like Hunter, Samia, and Stillwell did? Because Mr. Leroux also cooperated with the government. He did so for years. And he put himself and his family at serious risk of harm. Although he initially attempted to bribe Liberian law enforcement in order to escape apprehension, once that effort proved unsuccessful and he was placed on an airplane to this district, he began the process of cooperating with the government. And while he failed to mention his involvement in murders and violence at first, he ultimately did and provided voluminous, detailed, and heavily corroborated information. He actively engaged in communications with various associates in furtherance of ongoing investigations, and introduced them to DEA confidential informants. testified in a hearing in Minnesota and before me at the trial of Hunter, Samia, and Stillwell.

Mr. Leroux's cooperation led to the dismantling of his mercenary organization, the arrests and prosecution of over a dozen of his criminal associates, the seizure of kilograms of methamphetamine in the Philippines, and the use of critical physical evidence, including the van used during Catherine Lee's murder.

If judges don't give cooperating witnesses a significant benefit at sentencing, the criminal justice system will suffer, fewer people will cooperate, and the government will be unable to make important cases like those involving the murder of Catherine Lee. Cooperation is integral to the system.

The question then becomes, how much of a benefit should Mr. Leroux get for his cooperation? How do I balance that interest with the other interests I mentioned earlier, including public safety, deterrence, just punishment, and the need to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities? To help answer that question, I asked the parties to suggest cases they believed were analogous. The government was unable to provide a readily comparable case due to the sheer scope of Mr. Leroux's criminal conduct. Mr. Leroux urged me to consider the sentencing of Yi Tiong Tan Lim, who was a criminal kingpin in the Hong Kong Triad organization. He received a sentence of 138 months after he attempted to cooperate, but he was never signed up as a cooperating witness. But Lim does not appear to have engaged if any acts of violence. So that example is inapposite.

Just yesterday, his counsel also cited to two other cases purportedly involving heinous acts of violence. But since those materials were under seal, none of us were able to review them.

In any event, every sentencing is different. Every defendant is unique. This sentencing is especially so. This defendant testified before me about how he used 200 armed men in the hopes of becoming a warlord in Somalia, using, quote, whatever violence was necessary. That says a lot about who he is as a person. He wasn't just a mercenary. But he had his own mercenary team, shooting some people, including a former associate, himself, and ordering the murder of numerous others. Some murders were ordered simply out of paranoia. Not only did he smuggle gold and bribe countless foreign officials, but he sought to purchase not only a submarine but missile technology from North Korea so as to reverse-engineer it and sell it to Iran.

This is no ordinary defendant and no ordinary cooperating witness, particularly given the lack of genuine remorse, again, that I have felt up to this point in time. I heard remorse expressed today for the first time. Or efforts at rehabilitation other than his cooperation. In my view and in the view of the Probation Department, and in the view of the government, he still presents a danger to society. Indeed, I believe he continues to present a grave danger to society.

Finally, I've considered all the other arguments

Mr. Leroux has made in addition to his assistance with the
government, including but not limited to the difficult aspects
of his childhood in war-torn Zimbabwe and other war-related

traumas. I've considered his health issues. I've considered the case in the Philippines and the fact that he may face additional time there. I've considered the harm he and his family have faced as a result of the alleged improper leaks to the press, as well as his cooperation more generally.

So ultimately I have to balance all the information I have before me, the breadth of Mr. Leroux's conduct, what that conduct says about him as a person, which I think is a strong indicator of what someone is likely to do in the future, the grievous harm he caused, the extent of his cooperation, and everything else in the record, and I have to come up with a sentence that is sufficient but no greater than necessary.

In the Court's view, he must get a real, significant benefit, less than the life sentence recommended by the guidelines. But the sentence must also be sufficiently serious so as to deter him from returning to a life of senseless crime and to protect the public. I am ready to do so.

Mr. Leroux, it is the judgment of this Court that you be committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons for a term of 25 years. I'm going to read the breakdown of that sentence. You are to receive a sentence of 300 months on Count One of indictment 12 Crim. 489, 240 months on each of Count Two of 12 Crim. 489 and Counts Two and Three of 14 Crim. 75, 180 months on Count Four of 12 Crim. 489, and 60 months on each of Count Three of 12 Crim. 489 and Counts Two and Three of 14 Crim. 75,

all to run concurrently. So it's a total of 300 months' imprisonment on all counts.

With respect to supervised release, you'll receive a term of supervised release of life on Count One of 12 Crim.

489, three years on each of Counts Two through Four of 12 Crim.

489 and Counts One through Three of 14 Crim. 75, to run

concurrently, for a total of a life term of supervised release.

I recognize of course that you will be expect to be deported prior to that.

I also note for the record that Mr. Leroux has already served 92 months of that sentence.

I will also note that this is by far the longest sentence that I have imposed on a cooperating witness, but for the reasons I stated above, I firmly believe it to be necessary for this very unique case.

With respect to supervised release, all the standard conditions of supervised release shall apply. Counsel, would you like me to read those conditions out loud, or is that not necessary?

MR. CHABROWE: That's not. Jeff Chabrowe for Mr. Leroux. I don't believe that that's necessary, your Honor.

THE COURT: I am going to read the mandatory terms of supervised release:

You may not commit another federal, state, or local crime. You must not unlawfully possess a controlled substance.

You must refrain from any unlawful use of a controlled substance. You must submit to one drug test within 15 days of release from imprisonment and at least two periodic drug tests thereafter as determined by the Court.

I'm actually going to, at the recommendation of the Probation Department, I'm going to suspend the drug testing condition.

You must cooperate in the collection of DNA. And you must comply with the standard conditions that have been imposed.

I'm also going to impose the recommended special conditions that were recommended by the Probation Department. You must obey the immigration law and comply with the directives of immigration authority. You must participate in an outpatient mental health treatment program approved by the Probation Office. Must continue to take any prescribed medications unless otherwise instructed by the healthcare provider. You must contribute to the cost of services rendered based on your ability to pay and the availability of third-party payments.

The Court authorizes the release of available psychological and psychiatric evaluations and reports, including the presentence investigation report, to the healthcare provider.

You shall submit your person and any property,

residence, vehicle, papers, computer, and other electronic communication, data storage devices, cloud storage, or media and effects to a search by the United States Probation Office and, if needed, with the assistance of any law enforcement. The search is to be conducted at a reasonable time and in a reasonable manner, when there is reasonable suspicion concerning violation of a condition of your supervision or unlawful conduct by the person being supervised. Failure to submit to a search may be grounds for revocation of release. You shall warn any occupants at the premises that they also may be subject to searches pursuant to this condition. Any search shall be conducted at a reasonable time and in a reasonable manner.

You must provide the probation officer with any requested financial information. And you must not incur new credit card charges or open lines of credit unless you're in compliance with the payment schedule.

With respect to a fine, what's the government's position?

MR. LOCKARD: Your Honor, I'll address the fine in just a moment. We had also requested in our sentencing letter that the Court issue an oral order for the forfeiture pursuant to Title 18, Sections 981 and 982, and Title 21, Section 853, of the forfeiture of the proceeds of Mr. Leroux's offenses, as well as the instrumentalities of the money laundering and

narcotics offenses, with credit for assets that have been confiscated by foreign governments or that the defendant expended in furtherance of law enforcement operations. And we would propose to submit a written order to the Court following the sentencing.

THE COURT: Yes. I intended to do that, in an order to that effect. I will order forfeiture to that effect.

With respect to restitution, are you intending to submit a restitution order?

MR. LOCKARD: We will also submit a restitution order under Section 3663(a) of Title 18.

THE COURT: So, again, forfeiture will be ordered as requested by the government. A restitution order will be submitted within 90 days.

I am required to impose the mandatory special assessment of \$700, which is a hundred dollars per count, which will be paid immediately.

And are you requesting a fine or are you not doing that in light of the forfeiture and restitution orders?

MR. LOCKARD: I think with respect to a fine, we would agree with probation's recommendation.

THE COURT: All right. So no fine will be imposed.

Does either counsel know of any legal reason why this sentence cannot be imposed?

MR. BRANDEN: Jim Branden. No, Judge.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

You have a right to appeal your conviction and sentence Court. except to whatever extent you may have validly waived that right as part of your plea agreement. If you do choose to appeal, the notice of appeal must be filed within 14 days of the judgment of conviction. If you're not able to pay for the cost of an appeal, you may apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis, which simply means the court costs and filing fees will be waived. If you request, the Clerk of Court will prepare and file a notice of appeal on your behalf.

Are there any open counts or underlying indictments that need to be dismissed against Mr. Leroux?

MR. LOCKARD: There are, your Honor. At this time the government moves to dismiss all open counts.

THE COURT: All right. They will be dismissed.

Are there any other applications at this time?

MR. CHABROWE: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. We're adjourned.

MR. CHABROWE: Thank you.

(Adjourned)

21

22

23

24

25